

# THE POLYNESIAN.

SATURDAY, MARCH 31, 1890.

## More about Education.

We can fancy that not a few of our readers will lay the paper down with a toss, and pool-pool the idea of being again treated to an educational sermon. But we deprecate their impatience and request their attention; for, after carefully going over in our mind the various duties of a government and the different points of its connection with the people, we find none which, in its application to this country, is of greater importance and, with all respect be it spoken, less understood than the education of the common people.

We hope that it will not be necessary for us to prove what is so very patent, as to obtrude itself upon the perception of the most ordinary intellect that chooses to look around itself without those sectarian spectacles, which we have so often objected to, as being neither useful nor ornamental on the nose of a savage.

We will therefore be brief, knowing well that "it is the frequent dropping that wears the stone." Let us take the foreign relations of the country and see how far they may be affected by the ignorance and immorality of the masses.

It is well known how the ignorance and sectarian spectacles of the rulers and successive legislatures from 1840 to 1855 prevented that modification of the tariff by which our relations with France were finally and amicably settled. How the ten years' experiment of a reduced liquor duty—which, like the sorrows of a young bear, are still in store for us—might have been passed by this time, and we been the wiser by a knowledge which yet has to be acquired. How, with treaties of amity and commerce with many of the first and second-rate powers of the world, opening this country, in every sense of the word, to their citizens, to travel, reside and possess,—we never know the moment when we may not be involved in official correspondence, diplomatic difficulties or international reprisals, through the ignorance or stupidity of some petty official, or through the want of a common language, by which private provocations may be avoided, and public opinion may make itself heard in the remotest corners of the land. How the present calm and serene condition of foreign affairs is entirely owing to the fervent and unceasing watchfulness of the heads of the various departments, rather than to the normal condition or self-reliant consciousness of those beneath them. And finally, how few, how very few, of Hawaiian lineage and Hawaiian education are competent to fill the places of the foreign born officials, and practically and wisely second the efforts of the King to "preserve the land in righteousness," and, by taking a new departure through the transition desert, hurry up the educational processes of his people so as to make those equal in fact with a premature constitution has made equal in law. But when, moreover, we take into consideration the solemn fact that, should any misfortune, such as prolonged sickness or death, affect the lives of the King and his brother during the minority of the Prince Royal,—there is no man of Hawaiian blood and education, now living and of man's estate, whose mental acquirements and social position would point him out as the proper person to guard the interests of the country's hope (the young Prince)—to manage the helm of state with that *main de fer* and *gant de velours* which is absolutely necessary to govern a people during a transition period so hurried as this has been, and necessarily must be to the end, or the people perish in the wilderness,—to stand between the native and the foreigner, the friend of this, the protector of the other,—to keep a quiet tongue in a discreet head and, as "revolutions never go backward," complete the revolution of '52 and its supplement of '53 by those municipal institutions, of some sort, which are the political school of the people, the field and the stimulus to their ambition, and the safety valve of constitutional governments;—when these great and solemn facts are considered, we can easily form a vivid idea of the imminent perils to which not only the present foreign relations but also the political independence and national existence of the people are exposed under an educational system which, during thirty-five years' trial, saving the two royal brothers, has hardly produced a single pupil competent to head a department or conduct a regency.

These are bitter truths; but we hope they will prove salutary in urging upon all sound and reflecting minds the necessity of educational reforms, while there yet remains a population to be benefited by them.

Nor are the domestic relations of the country less affected by the ignorance and immorality of the masses.

Go through the country where one may, and, with a very exceptional perception of proper means to a proper result, the great mass of the country population are as ignorant as ever of the nature and preparation of soils, the adaptation of seeds, and the employment of machinery. Even their old knowledge of the management of their potato and taro-patches is being lost; ignorance producing poverty, and poverty inducing repeated crops from exhausted fields. And capital to develop and improve the lands will not invest where labor is not intelligent or attentive.

How the social relations are affected by the ignorance and immorality of the masses we have so often portrayed that we do not now choose to refer to it again.

With such data before us, is it not passing strange that there should be found men in this community, pretending to practical piety, ordinary morality (except in questions of truth), and an occasional grain of common sense, who, arguing in behalf of the ignorance of the people and the system which perpetuates it, set up as a counter-fact that "children of the poor and uneducated classes do not, to a great extent in any country, receive moral training at home, and still they are sent to the public schools with all their bad habits, because that is the best that can be done for them, and that is a great deal better than nothing."

Did the writer of the above remarkable salvo for ignorance and immorality know—and he could not but know—that in almost "any country," with which we may be compared, the children of the middle classes and of the industrious and better behaved poor, and who receive more or less of

a moral training at home and a sense of propriety—that these children form the great majority in every school and give tone and character to it, and crowd those other children, who have received no moral training at home, into an insignificant and respectful minority? But if the children of the ignorant poor in this country are no worse than the same class in other countries, will the writer, to whom we refer, pretend that the children of the middle classes here, nay, even of the higher classes, receive the same, or similar moral training at home, as the same class in other countries? And if he cannot muster another sophism to parry that truth; if he must admit that his analogy is not perfect, then where shall these children receive that training if not in the school,—but in a school where the conscience is free as it would be at home;—in separate schools, and through the English language?

The same writer (see the *Advertiser* of Thursday last) says:

"The fact is, the domestic training of this people, in the circumstances, is more a question of means than anything else, and can only be secured at great expense, which neither the government nor private liberality, to any great extent, can afford."

He admits the want of domestic training, and he must know that it is not partial and local, but universal; and yet, instead of looking upon that want as a question of life and death to this people, on which all other conditions depend, to which all other wants must bow, he treats it as "a question of means," of dollars and cents, that may be thought of and have something done for it the next year or the next century; and if this people should have expired through ignorance and vice before that time—the money will do for their successors!

And, when we argue the necessity of radically changing a system of education which ignores this great primary want of a people, we are coolly told that the Government "cannot afford it," and we are offered the consolation that the ignorant poor of this country are no worse off than the ignorant poor in other countries!

With such moralists we have no controversy.

Public opinion is truly powerful; so much so, that even an independent journal, like our contemporary, is sometimes obliged to bow to its dictates and comply with its requisitions. The *Advertiser* has "hung fire" upon the education question so long, that the public seriously began to ask itself what could be the matter that a journal, which generally went off at half-cock, should delay for nearly two months to enter into the discussion of a subject which concerns the character, the progress and the very existence of this people so nearly.

It now tells us, however, that it "purposely abstained," not because it was indifferent to the subject—(of course not; its Thursday's article clearly shows in which direction its interest lies)—"but that (we) might deliver (ourselves) of whatever ideas (we) have had to put forward, without being left off into side issues." We are grateful for its forbearance, for we know from repeated experience how difficult it is for the *Advertiser* to keep itself to any question under discussion. But if that was its reason, why does it interrupt us now, with its "side issues" about historical facts and personal motives, its quibbles upon words and its tedious want of logic, its continued perversion of other men's meaning and its cool contempt for the greatest and most vital want that can possibly afflict any people? We will venture an answer in the words of the old saying, that "one must needs ride when the devil drives," and we give our contemporary credit for generally possessing too much shrewdness not to know by whom its bread is buttered, when it takes sides on public questions.

Having continued our ideas upon education in another article of to-day's paper, we will devote a few minutes to follow the *Advertiser* through some of its "side issues," and, as Oxenstiern said to his son, at the peace of Westphalia, "See, my son, with how little wisdom the world is governed," we shall find occasion to say to our readers: see, with how little truth and logic a leading article can be got up for an "independent journal!"

To begin. It says that the general reader, "after perusing (our articles) is left unable to discover what (our) object is, except that a change of some kind in our school system is sought for." That is just it. And even the *Advertiser* is compelled to admit that we have succeeded in making ourselves understood by the "general reader." A valuable fact, truly, and one as encouraging to us, as it may prove serviceable to the reader as aforesaid. The conviction that a change of some kind is wanted in our school system is the very starting point of our discussion, and if the "general reader" understands us on that point, we do not despair of seeing him come into the same conclusion as ourselves, despite of the "side issues" which the *Advertiser* is so indefatigable in raising, and which it apparently has "searched for in a quarter" where they ought not to have been found.

When we advance the want of moral training of the children at home, as one of the primary reasons for a change of the school system, and that such want leads to perjury, forgery and licentiousness, we are told not to alarm ourselves, for these things happen in the schools "of Boston and Berlin, the best in the world," and of course, we are led to infer, are quite unobjectionable here!

This needs no finger post from us.

We are "brought up all standing," as sailors say, upon "a matter of history," by our sharp-eyed critic, who has his "information from one who was present" at the meeting of missionary delegates at Lahainaluna in 1838. We said that "the State appealed to the religious element" (the missionaries) for the instruction of the young, and we are corrected by the counter assertion that it was the "missionaries who appealed to the State."

Let us go over that point again.

We commenced by speaking of the duties of States in the abstract, to see that the young received proper instruction, from the parents if possible, but if not, to delegate it to others to impart. We then surveyed the educational epochs in this country and divided them into three. The first from the arrival of the missionaries to 1840; the second from 1840 to 1854; and the last from 1854 until now. It was in speaking of the first period, and carrying out the above idea of the duty of a State, that we said that "the State appealed" &c., that is to say, that Kaahumanu and the Chiefs, who ruled the country nearly up to 1840, having

been converted to Christianity, and perceiving the great want of their people in that instruction, that moral training, which secures peace on earth and bliss in heaven, appealed to, and encouraged by gifts, by approval and by command, the early missionaries in establishing those schools and furnishing that instruction. The time "when" and "the way" in which that appeal was made we are not able to specify, never having had the patience to read through that singular compendium of unbacked bricks, called "Bingham's Sandwich Islands," in which, perhaps, they may be found.

It seems then that, instead of our being all wrong, both we and our critic are all right, and that sometime during the first period there was an appeal from the state to the missionaries for instruction, and that again in 1838, at the meeting at Lahainaluna, there was another appeal, but this time from the missionaries to the State to assume the expense of the schools and insure their regular payment.

On the little inaccuracies, contradictions and apparent confusion of the brain of our critic we care not to dwell, nor can we wonder at them, considering the time it took to prepare the article, and the deference due to "one who was present at the above conference" at Lahainaluna.

But what bearing has this "side-issue" on the main question? If none; why was it raised? To divert public attention?

We are further asked, as a "matter of history," if the domestic training was attended to during the first period, or while the character of the schools was denominational, and if then there were separate schools for boys and girls; and we are asked what evidence we have that it would be any more attended to hereafter, or the boys and girls be separately educated should we revert to that system.

That formerly the denominational schools did not separate the children was one of the greatest drawbacks to their usefulness that they had to contend with. And, if they turned out some "leading men both in Church and state," they did so in spite of that objectionable feature, and not in virtue of it. And the evidence we have, that,—were the denominational system reverted to at this time and with the present experience to guide us,—many if not all of the former objections would be removed, is our faith in human progress and the power of truth over even such intrepid advocates of the existing apology for education as our contemporary and that other "one who was present at the conference" at Lahainaluna in '38.

We are asked "what change has come over the missionaries that they would do differently now from what they did twenty-five years ago?"

It would require a volume to detail what changes the missionaries have undergone in that time, for their changes are part and parcel of the history of the country. But with all their changeableness, we would not do them so grievous a wrong as to assert with our critic that twenty-five years of experience have wrought no change in them, and that they stand now, like Lot's wife, with their faces to the past, immovable, unimprovable.

We said in our February number, which the *Advertiser* is now criticising, that "in 1854 the schools were secularized." &c., &c., by order of the Department." We are now asked, with an air of triumph, to produce that "order of the Department" before the critical court of our contemporary. The court has "searched for it in vain, and in a quarter where it ought to be found if ever it was issued."

Here is a question of veracity.

Our critic admits that previous to 1854 the schools were denominational, sectarian, Protestant and Catholic, and that since 1854 they have ceased to be such. Now we ask, how did they cease to be denominational; was it of their own free will and accord; was it by an enactment of the legislature, or through the operation of the executive functions of the Department? That they ceased of their own accord not even our critic is foolishly enough to assert. That they did not cease by act of the Legislature is fully proven by the legislative proceedings of 1854 and the report of the Committee of Education of that year to which our critic alludes. In his report to the legislature in April '54, the Minister of Public Instruction suggests, for reasons which we will touch upon by-and-by, that the free-schools be organized "according to territorial limits—without any regard to any religious sect whatever," and expresses his opinion that he was "not sure that any legislative action was required in the case." On the 6th June, same year, the Committee of Education, to whom the subject had been referred, reported that

"The approval of the Legislature is not needed to enable the Minister to organize the schools according to the above suggestion."

and that originally the Minister had organized the schools into Catholics and Protestants, according to discretionary powers conferred upon him by law, and "that while the law remains unchanged, the legislature has no right to interfere with the Minister in his action under it," and finally that the Committee were favorable to the secularization of the schools, although they did not think it necessary to enact a statute about it.

Now, as the denominational character of the schools did not cease of itself; as no legislative statute ordered it to cease, we ask again, by whose order did it cease? But, lest our veracity should be questioned, we will call upon the Minister of Public Instruction himself to tell us by whose order the change took place. In his report to the legislature of 1855, (the following year) he tells us that:

"In the above statistics of the schools no distinction is made, as in my former reports, between schools of different denominations. It is deemed unnecessary, since the full and explicit declaration of both houses of the Legislature of last year, that the government free schools should be conducted without regard to any religious sect whatever, agreeably to the theory of our laws. The recommendation has been carried out by a circular approved by the King and Council and addressed to each of the school inspectors in the twenty-five districts. A copy of this circular is submitted herewith marked D."

If our critic will take two months more for it, and diligently search "in the quarter where it ought to be found"—that is, in the archives of the Department—he will probably find that Circular Order "marked D," to which the Minister refers, and which was "issued" by the Department and "approved by the King and Council."

We now ask "the general reader," were we right or were we wrong in saying that the schools were secularized "by order of the Department?" Having thus extricated ourselves from the impu-

tation of untruth, we leave the question of veracity to be settled between the then Minister of Public Instruction and the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, and would simply ask who raised this new side issue, and what bearing has it upon the main question of the necessity of a change in the school system?

When we referred to the reasons for secularizing the schools, we advanced as one, though not exclusive of others, that it was to carry out the principle of religious liberty. We find, on perusing the Report of the Minister, that we received a wrong impression at the time, and that the change had not even so good a reason for it—misunderstood, as it would have been, by subsequent acts of the Legislature—but that it was economy, sharpened by jealousy of the Mormons, who had been making considerable fuss about that time, and were making rapid progress in conducting Protestant members into their own fold. The Department was unwilling to maintain Mormon schools, as Protestant and Catholic schools were maintained, and discovered (what had escaped it before), the points of economy involved in their separate maintenance, and found also (for the first time!) that sectarian schools were not "in accordance with the theory of our laws." And if that theory applies to the organization of the schools, should it not apply to the Department likewise?

We are accused of "ignorance or malevolence." The dilemma is rather painful, we admit, and to escape the latter we plead the former. We may, possibly, be ignorant, for we had not our information "from one who was present at the conference in 1838, and took part in the discussion," but we relied upon the published Reports of the Department, and shall be very sorry to learn that they are such "very poor authority on the subject of Hawaiian schools and education."

Little, scurrilous, half-fledged souls never can argue a question without making their points out of personal matters. We never retaliate, for we are strong enough to regard such attacks with the contempt they deserve. We will therefore say nothing of our critic's remarks about our personal motives and the cast of our piety; they are not within his province, and we trust, are in the keeping of cleaner hands than his own. But this is another side-issue, and what bearing has it upon the main question; by whom was it raised, and for what purpose?

## PAST WEEK.

### Return of His Majesty.

On Tuesday afternoon last a royal salute from the battery on Punchbowl Hill announced the return of His Majesty, the King, from Lahaina. His Majesty was accompanied by the Governor of Maui, Hon. C. G. Hopkins, Doctor Hutchinson and Mr. Neilson.

### Return of the Brig "Agate."

We had the pleasure on Monday to welcome the return of A. Mitchell, Esq., of the firm of Messrs. C. A. Williams & Co., and Dr. Drysdale, from their cruise among the Guano islands of the South Pacific, and from those gentlemen gathered the following general account:

On arrival at McKean's Island they found the *Bowditch* had sailed on the 11th January with 450 tons of guano, and the *Aspinia* with 800 tons. Visiting Enderbury's Island, they discovered it had been visited by the schooner *St. Vernon* from San Francisco, and taken possession of by the people who came in her, in the name of the United States. Two of them were on the island, one of whom was nearly blind from the effects of the sun, and would probably lose his eyesight. They were short of provisions and water, with the *Agate* supplied them as far as she was able. Gov. E. C. Pope, with a native, was left in charge of Phoenix Island. On their return, after visiting other Islands, the schooner left McKean's on the 16th February, stopping at Baker's Island on the 18th. The *Flying Dragon* had sailed on the 7th February for Hampton Roads, with 1225 tons guano. The *Josiah Bradlee* and the *Daring* were loading at the rate of 100 tons per day, notwithstanding the absence of the wharf, which had been destroyed. The *Josiah Bradlee* led to leeward, and was 37 days getting her moorings, and had an unfortunate time of it. Had injured her copper a little against the buoys. Great praise is due to the energy of Gov. Chas. H. Judd for triumphing over the obstacles which he has had to encounter the past six months in the destruction of the "ways and means" provided for loading the vessels sent there. He has succeeded now in laying fine moorings a mile from shore, not affected by the swell at which the *Great Eastern* might swing.

The *Agate*, after undergoing some slight repairs, will return to Baker's and McKean's Islands with supplies, and from thence on a northern trading cruise.

### New Furniture.

The Aladdin-like change of making a new Store out of an old one, could not be better exemplified than in the difference presented now by the old building on Fort Street, below King, formerly used by Messrs. Fatt & Ahee, as a molasses warehouse, at present as a Furniture Show Sales Room, by Mr. C. E. Williams. The new, fresh, and cleanly appearance of articles strikes the most careless observer as he passes by, and tempts any one who suddenly remembers he wants an article of household comfort in that line to go in and invest. Such persons could not do better than to follow their first impulses.

### House Warming.

Mr. G. G. Howe extended a general invitation to his friends to call upon him at his new place of business on Fort Street, on Monday, and at about 12 o'clock M., there was a much more enthusiastic crowd there than at the auction room of Messrs. Melchers & Co. A fine spread had been prepared for both foreign and native residents, and the manner in which they devoted their attention to the business before them was refreshing even to a looker on.

### Merited Compliment.

Captain Williams, of the British bark *Imogene*, has been formally presented with a splendid gold chronometer and chain from the President of the United States, as a testimonial of gratitude for Captain Williams' humanity to the wrecked crew of the ship *Fleetwood*, of Boston, lost off Cape Horn last year on the passage to these islands.

### Free Lunch.

Our worthy neighbor, Mr. W. E. Cutrell, of the Merchant's Exchange Hotel, taking into consideration the hard times, gives a free lunch to-day at 11 A. M., and will continue to do so hereafter.

This bar-bar-ous treatment of his friends by "Peck," will be duly appreciated by them, and rewarded by quiet smiles.

### Queen's Hospital.

The following is the quarterly report of Dr. Hillbrand, to the Trustees of the Queen's Hospital:

**GENERAL.**—Since January first, 264 new dispensary patients have applied for relief at the hospital. 964 prescriptions have been made up in the same space of time, which number also will represent tolerably correct the aggregate of consultations given in the dispensary. During the same period, twenty-seven new house-patients have been received, which number, added to eleven present on the 1st of January, gives 38 house-patients for this quarter. Out of this number four have died, fourteen have been dismissed, and ten are remaining this day. The greatest number of house-patients present at one time was seventeen. The prevalence of bad weather during the months of February and March, and the bad state of the country roads resulting therefrom, together with the extraordinarily good state of the general health, which ruled at the same time, have caused a considerable falling off in the applications for relief in the dispensary. With the first appearance of good weather, however, the attendance has begun again to increase.

On the 10th of March, the hospital was moved to the temporary establishment on the newly acquired premises at the foot of Punchbowl. We have reason to be satisfied with the change; the new building is more spacious, affords accommodation for twenty patients, and being less cut up in small apartments than the old one, admits of freer and safer ventilation. The climate of the new location is greatly preferable to that of the old one. Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM HILLBRAND, M. D.  
Honolulu, March 26, 1890.

The following preamble and resolution was passed by the Board of Trustees of the Queen's Hospital at their quarterly meeting, March 26, 1890:

**WHEREAS,** It is necessary for the information of the Board of Trustees of the Queen's Hospital, that they may be enabled to judge of their ability to erect a suitable building for the necessities of the Queen's Hospital, to know who have neglected to pay their subscriptions, that they may ascertain whether they are to be realized:

**Resolved,** That the Secretary be requested to furnish at the next meeting a list of the subscribers who have paid their subscriptions and the amount due from each.—P. C. Adm.

### Cruelty to Animals.

The following query was suddenly put to our reporter at the morning breakfast table: "Why would it be impossible for a man to starve on the deserts of Sahara?" and to his inability to answer the question, notwithstanding he had just finished reading "Livingstone's Travels," the reply was: "On account of the sand which is (sandwiches) there." Before he could recover his breath at this atrocity, he heard the following: "How came the sandwiches there?" and utterly swooned when it was whispered by White, "that the sons of Ham were bred (a) and mustered there!"

### Take Notice, Jurymen!

We are requested to state for the information of the foreign jurors at the ensuing session of the Supreme Court, that their presence will not be required until Monday, the 9th of April next, at 9 o'clock A. M., the Court having decided to open the session with the native cases on the calendar.

### Quick Time.

The schooner *Mary* left here on Saturday and returned again yesterday, having made the run to Kaula, obtained a full freight, and returned to port in five and a half days.

Among the arrivals from Lahaina on Tuesday last, we noticed Mr. H. A. Neilson; to attend to whose case and comfortable removal to Honolulu, we learn, was the sole object of His Majesty's late trip to Lahaina. We are glad to learn that Mr. Neilson is not worse for the fatigue of the journey, but as his strength is yet feeble, his many friends will consult his interest by delaying their visits for a few days.

### PRESIDENT FOR OAHU COLLEGE.

Advices were received by the last mail that Rev. C. T. Mills has been appointed to the presidency of Oahu College, and that he may be expected out some time during the coming fall. He is highly spoken of by those capable of judging of his qualifications for the office.—P. C. Advertiser.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE POLYNESIAN.

SIR:—In looking over a recent number of the *Commercial* paper published alongside your own, I read a communication signed "A Subscriber," which gave rise in my mind to mingled emotions of pity and contempt. In the first instance I thought the writer might possibly be one of those unfortunate persons who, with a smattering of education and a shallow pace, are so often put to a sense of their own wisdom that they are always putting themselves forward as public censors; but, on second consideration, the smack of bigotry was so plainly to be perceived, that I had no difficulty in fixing the "who, where and why" of your contemporary's correspondent, who so summarily arraigned you at the bar of public opinion as the advocate of intemperance and immorality.

I am aware that there is a class here, as in every other community on God's earth, who persist in viewing every thing through the medium of their own contracted minds, always holding the telescope wrong end to their eyes, and who are invariably a generation behind the rest of the world in liberal and progressive ideas. "A Subscriber" is undoubtedly one of this class. Men of just such a spirit hung witches and enacted blue laws in New England, and burned their fellow creatures to death in other countries for an inability to believe as they did. That same spirit of selfishness and intolerance drove the Catholics from these islands, per-secuted their followers, enacted a set of laws—religious-political—which in their rigor resembled the burdensome enactments of Moses, and generally "established the life of the land in righteousness."

At the end of a single generation, they gave up this nation as "doomed to extinction," and confess that their teachings,—after all the great revivals they have chronicled, the many thousands they have baptized into the church, the millions of pages they have printed, their teachings and their life-long labors have been all but useless so far as making this a real Christian people. For true Christianity never drove a people to extinction; quite the contrary: it has always given them a vital energy, a sort of compensating balance, so that they have easily recovered from the shock of war, pestilence or other disaster. If, then, as the aforesaid class maintain, this people is inevitably doomed to extinction, the conclusion one would arrive at, reasoning from analogous cases, is that they have never yet been christianized. And notwithstanding these nation-savers have by their own confession failed in the object of their labors, they still cling to the water-logged wreck which they have fairly proved themselves incapable of navigating, and when any one offers to lend a hand to put up a jury-mast and make sail on the weather-baten craft, they blacken his motives, and holding up both hands in holy horror, cry, "intemperance and licentiousness!" The one idea that all the honesty and all the religion is confined to their own particular set has so completely taken possession of this class of bigots that, like a certain people some 1800 and odd years ago, they will not believe that any good can come out of Nazareth, and whenever a proposition does come from the aforesaid Nazareth, they immediately set it down as damnable, without the troublesome process of enquiry or examination.

As to the probable working of the line of state policy which you advocate and which has set Mr. Subscriber calling you names instead of stating his reasons for disagreeing with you,—now, notwithstanding you do come out of Nazareth,—I am inclined to think there may be some good in you. At least, I shall give you credit for good intentions, and that, we are told, is something by way of a pavement. I will not undertake to say that you are quite right as to the safety and desirableness of opening the liquor traffic to the natives, for knowing their character as well as I do, I confess the experiment seems to me a hazardous one. The people of Honolulu are undoubtedly familiar with the use and traffic of spirits, as my daily observation proves, and a change in the law such as is contemplated would probably have but little effect on the practice of those of the native population here who are inclined to use spirits. There is no real bar—only a straw one—between their getting as much as they can pay for, and to remove the restriction would take away one incentive—that of running in the face of the law. Natives, like other children, like to taste forbidden fruit. But with the people on the other islands the case would be different, and great excesses would be the rule with a very many whenever they visited Honolulu, which we know is pretty often. Besides this, and more mischievous too, there would spring up a considerable liquor traffic between the islands, and for a time at least, while the means lasted, bad whiskey would take the place of sugar potatoes and the comparatively harmless bananas here. The result can be imagined, and must be dreaded. But perhaps you will say, this will last but a very short time; the novelty of the thing will wear off; possession of the legal right will blunt desire, and the people learn to use edge tools without cutting their fingers. True, it will last no longer than the means to purchase, but in that short time what vices, murders, etc., may come must give pause; and as to your favorite argument that people must learn self-restraint, my answer is, the Hawaiians are very slow to learn it, and giving them liquor to practice on is rather too fiery an ordeal. I am afraid that in a great many instances the result would be an empty whiskey keg and a full coffin. Time, to be sure, which accomplishes all things, would not doubt make a nation of temperate drinkers of the Hawaiians, but the expense would be dreadful. Were I a member of the Legislature, I would go for repealing all restrictions or trammel on the manufacture of wine and offer a premium for the best and largest quantity made from home grapes; but I confess that, until I get more light, I cannot go for making spirits any more easy access to the mass of the people.

But the constitutional question stares me in the face. The only way to get over that difficulty, I must acknowledge, will be to put the screws on all His Majesty's subject alike, whether foreign or native born; forbid spirits to all. Perhaps it will bring native wine into fashion—who's got any?—and help the Dashways. Don't you think mine is a statesman-like mode of getting rid of a constitutional difficulty? Two lines did the business.

Having frankly told you wherein I disagree with you on one side of the liquor question,—though I give you credit for honestly believing that my reasoning is shallow,—I hope you will bear with me in my next,—whenever I get time to write it—in which I shall show where in I do agree with you. Yours, &c., Vms.

may be some good in you. At least, I shall give you credit for good intentions, and that, we are told, is something by way of a pavement. I will not undertake to say that you are quite right as to the safety and desirableness of opening the liquor traffic to the natives, for knowing their character as well as I do, I confess the experiment seems to me a hazardous one. The people of Honolulu are undoubtedly familiar with the use and traffic of spirits, as my daily observation proves, and a change in the law such as is contemplated would probably have but little effect on the practice of those of the native population here who are inclined to use spirits. There is no real bar—only a straw one—between their getting as much as they can pay for, and to remove the restriction would take away one incentive—that of running in the face of the law. Natives, like other children, like to taste forbidden fruit. But with the people on the other islands the case would be different, and great excesses would be the rule with a very many whenever they visited Honolulu, which we know is pretty often. Besides this, and more mischievous too, there would spring up a considerable liquor traffic between the islands, and for a time at least, while the means lasted, bad whiskey would take the place of sugar potatoes and the comparatively harmless bananas here. The result can be imagined, and must be dreaded. But perhaps you will say, this will last but a very short time; the novelty of the thing will wear off; possession of the legal right will blunt desire, and the people learn to use edge tools without cutting their fingers. True, it will last no longer than the means to purchase, but in that short time what vices, murders, etc., may come must give pause; and as to your favorite argument that people must learn self-restraint, my answer is, the Hawaiians are very slow to learn it, and giving them liquor to practice on is rather too fiery an ordeal. I am afraid that in a great many instances the result would be an empty whiskey keg and a full coffin. Time, to be sure, which accomplishes all things, would not doubt make a nation of temperate drinkers of the Hawaiians, but the expense would be dreadful. Were I a member of the Legislature, I would go for repealing all restrictions or trammel on the manufacture of wine and offer a premium for the best and largest quantity made from home grapes; but I confess that, until I get more light, I cannot go for making spirits any more easy access to the mass of the people.

But the constitutional question stares me in the face. The only way to get over that difficulty, I must acknowledge, will be to put the screws on all His Majesty's subject alike, whether foreign or native born; forbid spirits to all. Perhaps it will bring native wine into fashion—who's got any?—and help the Dashways. Don't you think mine is a statesman-like mode of getting rid of a constitutional difficulty? Two lines did the business.

Having frankly told you wherein I disagree with you on one side of the liquor question,—though I give you credit for honestly believing that my reasoning is shallow,—I hope you will bear with me in my next,—whenever I get time to write it—in which I shall show where in I do agree with you. Yours, &c., Vms.

## LATEST FOREIGN DATES.

Hongkong	Jan 28 Panama	Feb 1
Liverpool	Jan 28 Paris	Jan 28
Manila	Jan 28 San Francisco	Jan 28
Shanghai	Jan 28 St. Louis	Jan 28
Yokohama	Jan 28 Yokohama	Jan 28
Yokohama	Jan 28 Yokohama	Jan 28
Yokohama	Jan 28 Yokohama	Jan 28
Yokohama	Jan 28 Yokohama	Jan 28

## COMMERCIAL.

FRIDAY, MARCH 26, 1890.

Trade the past week has been quiet, and although it was generally expected there would be a falling off from the amount transacted at the corresponding period of last year, the actual state of affairs now existing was not looked for by our merchants. Most of the Spring fleet which have arrived have not entered the harbor, but "lay off and on," merely communicating with the shore to obtain their letters, and their own in return, sending off a boat or two with the few recruits which are absolutely necessary, and as soon as they are taken on board, leave for their cruising grounds.

The arrival of the *Onward*, Capt. Allen, from Margarita Bay, gives us a further report of the coast of California Fleet, and the average shows a fair catch for "between seasons